

Texaco is the operator of this project. Marathon Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Mobil Exploration and Production U.S. Inc., and 15 others are interest owners in the project.

New Mexico is blessed with magnificent oil and gas reserves. It is doubly blessed because it is also the home to the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology Petroleum Recovery Research Center. The center has served as a focal point for development and application of improved oil and gas recovery processes. They have a world-renowned reputation as one of the leading petroleum research centers. They were very helpful in developing the original legislation.

In every oil- and gas-producing State, there are aging oil and gas fields with declining production, that could be made more productive using enhanced oil recovery techniques. I am pleased that there is a fine example in New Mexico. It is providing 100 jobs in addition to adding to our energy security.●

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Ukrainian Independence Day. Since its independence on August 24, 1991, The Ukrainian Government has taken several bold steps to reform the country after many years of Soviet rule. We should take this opportunity today to review the success that Ukraine has recently experienced.

In 1994, Ukraine held legislative and Presidential elections. These elections were carried out in an open and fair manner that bodes well for stable democracy in Ukraine. Ukraine now exhibits signs of a healthy democracy, including the existence of multiple interests represented within the Government, and last year, Ukraine overwhelmingly enacted a new constitution which guarantees the right of private ownership.

Ukraine has also focused on reforming its economy with some significant results. The Government has taken steps to improve the investment climate in Ukraine. In order to further promote privatization, the President of Ukraine signed the State Privatization Program for 1997. Ukraine also launched a new currency, the hryvna, and inflation has been reduced dramatically.

Ukraine's efforts on security issues may be its most successful. The Government has been rightfully lauded for its efforts to rid Ukrainian soil of nuclear weapons by faithfully following guidelines under the START I Treaty and other agreements. And, by joining the Partnership for Peace Program for NATO membership, Ukraine has shown its determination to contribute to the security of Europe.

The people of Ukraine deserve our admiration and support for the fine work they have done in such a short period of time. The Ukrainian-American community in Michigan is in the front ranks of such support. I know my Sen-

ate colleagues join me in celebrating the sixth anniversary of Ukrainian independence.●

#### PROTECT TRUTH IN LABELING

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, last Thursday, Senator HOLLINGS and I introduced a resolution that aims to protect truth in labeling and, specifically, the integrity of the "Made in USA" label. It would express the sense of Congress that the Federal Trade Commission should retain the current standard for labeling products "Made in USA."

For over 50 years now, Mr. President, consumer goods have been labeled "Made in USA" when, and only when, they were made all or virtually all in the United States. But recently the FTC announced plans to allow companies to use the "Made in USA" label on products for which U.S. manufacturing costs represent as little as 75 percent of total manufacturing costs and the product was last substantially transformed in the United States. Alternatively, a product could be labeled "Made in USA" if it was last substantially transformed in the United States and all its significant inputs were last substantially transformed in the United States.

In practice, Mr. President, this means that products containing no materials or parts of U.S. origin could nonetheless be labeled as "Made in USA." Should the company expend 75 percent of its manufacturing costs or engage in the final substantive assembly or other modification of the product in the United States, it could display the "Made in USA" label on the product, even if its entire content, including manufactured parts, came from overseas.

In my view, Mr. President, such rules would in effect condone false advertising. Many Americans look specifically for the "Made in USA" label because they want to support American workers. These loyal Americans do not believe that they are purchasing products mostly made in the USA, let alone products for which most manufacturing costs were incurred in the USA, or which were substantially transformed in the USA. Quite rightly, consumers who look for the "Made in USA" label believe that in purchasing a product with that label they are getting something made all or virtually all in the United States.

Also important, Mr. President, are the expectations of the many companies that have made substantial investments in plant and equipment, as well as hiring and training, in the United States. These companies have a right to expect that the "Made in USA" label, which they have worked so hard to earn and maintain, will continue to apply only to products made all, or virtually all, in the United States.

To dilute the requirement for use of the "Made in USA" label would be to lower the value of that label. It would

allow companies operating substantially overseas to deceive American consumers who are attempting to support truly American made products and workers. It would discourage companies from investing in this country by telling them, in effect, that they will no longer receive any benefit for keeping jobs at home. The result would be a loss of American jobs and morale, as well as a critical blow to consumer confidence in the veracity of product labels.

Mr. President, the American people have a right to expect that the "Made in USA" label will mean what it says. For over 50 years they have depended on that label to assure them that they are purchasing products made all or virtually all in the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in sending the message to the FTC that we must keep things that way.●

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d-276g, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate delegation to the Canada-United States Inter-parliamentary Group during the first session of the 105th Congress, to be held in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, Canada, September 11-15, 1997:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURKOWSKI], Chairman;

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH];

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DEWINE]; and

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI].

#### REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 105-26

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on September 15, 1997, by the President of the United States:

Protocol with Mexico Amending Convention for Protection of Migratory Birds (Treaty Document No. 105-26).

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol